

Dear Paul,

12/30/78

Enclosed is the hasty letter I wrote Jeff Goldberg this morning after a hasty skimming of his assortment of proposals for the future.

In it I make reference to your comment on Blakey, which I regard as a personal endorsement of him and as a professional endorsement of his work.

If you would care to provide an explanation for this belief that I do not find in that AIN newsletter I would be interested. I regard the man's record as monstrous, as of incredible dishonesty, and that this dishonesty is both personal and professional.

Restricting myself of the JFK case I give you a simple illustration, a brief note I passed to Gardner about the time the internal mutual-admirations vomit started to gush forth from staff and Member mouths, beginning with Blakey's.

I asked him if he recalled a single effort the committee made to place Oswald either at the so-called sniper's nest or anywhere near the scene of the crime.

I ask you the same question and add Ray and the King assassination to it.

This is Blakey's responsibility.

We have a six-million investigation and no effort to place either accused even in a position to have pulled either job and yet you endorse the man responsible.

This example pops into mind while I rush to get to other things. It is typical. It is the committee's/Blakey's record.

I'm hoping to be able to get to files I've not had time to examine but have received. First take accumulated legal work. I hope no new emergencies in these case come up so I can go over records.

Have a good year.